

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated June 23, 2010 ("Office Action"). Claims 3 and 37-57 are pending in the application. Applicants amend Claims 3, 37, 39, 44-47, 49-54, and 56 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants add new Claims 58-60, which are fully supported by Applicants' Specification as originally filed and which add no new matter. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 3 and 37-57. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Interview Summary

Applicants' Attorney, Brad Johnson (Reg. No. 66,579), conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Zenati on August 23, 2010. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 713.04, Applicants submit this summary of the telephonic interview to record Applicants' understanding of the substance of the interview. If Applicants' understanding is inaccurate, notice of such is appreciated.

Attorney for Applicants thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of his telephone interview. During the interview, Applicants discussed the Examiner's rejection of Claims 3, 37, 44, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in light of proposed amendments. Applicants presented the arguments set forth below in the Response. The Examiner agreed that some elements appeared to articulate patentable distinctions between the cited references and Applicants' claims, but that an additional search and/or reconsideration was required.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 37-40 and 42-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,357,017 B1 issued to Bereiter, et al. ("*Bereiter*"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,578 B1 issued to Gilles, et al. ("*Gilles*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for several reasons, as discussed further below.

For example, the proposed *Gilles-Bereiter* combination fails to disclose every element of Claim 3. Claim 3 recites:

A method of providing self-supporting computer systems, comprising:
detecting, with a computer system, a fault that has occurred in the
computer system;

automatically consulting, using the computer system, a service policy comprising one or more service policy rules associated with the computer system to request a solution for the detected fault that occurred in the computer system;

automatically determining, based on the service policy, one or more actions to be taken to respond to the request, the one or more actions related to providing the solution to the detected fault, wherein the one or more actions comprise:

determining, based on the service policy, a service level agreement associated with a user of the computer system;

determining, based on the service policy, whether a trouble ticket should be opened; and

determining whether a password associated with the computer system should be reset;

automatically initiating the one or more actions;

automatically invoking one or more service provider tools to perform the one or more actions in response to the request; and

communicating one or more service events that occurred as a result of the automatically initiating one or more actions and the automatically invoking one or more service provider tools wherein the communicating includes logging the one or more service events.

I. "wherein the one or more actions comprise determining, based on the service policy, a service level agreement associated with a user of the computer system."

The proposed *Gilles-Bereiter* combination fails to disclose this element of Claim 3. Non-limiting support and further discussion related to this element can be found at least on page 1, line 19 - page 2, line 2, page 5, lines 23-25, page 6, lines 26 - page 7, line 2, page 7 lines 12 - 22, and page 9, lines 17-21.

II. "wherein the one or more actions comprise determining, based on the service policy, whether a trouble ticket should be opened"

The proposed *Gilles-Bereiter* combination fails to disclose this element of Claim 3. Non-limiting support and further discussion related to this element can be found at least on page 1, line 19 - page 2, line 2, page 2, lines 23-30, page 4, lines 22-32, page 5, lines 14-23, page 7, lines 12-22, and page 9, lines 16-21.

III. "wherein the one or more actions comprise determining whether a password associated with the computer system should be reset"

The proposed *Gilles-Bereiter* combination fails to disclose this element of Claim 3. Non-limiting support and further discussion related to this element can be found at least on page 1, line 19 - page 2, line 2, page 2, lines 23-30, page 5, lines 1-6, page 5, lines 14-23, page 7, lines 12-22, page 9, lines 17-21.

Accordingly, the proposed *Gilles-Bereiter* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose every element of Claim 3 for at least these reasons. Claim 3 is therefore allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 37, 44, and 50 are allowable for at least analogous reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 3, 37, 44, 50, and their respective dependent claims.

New Claims

The proposed *Gilles-Bereiter* combination fails to disclose every element of Claims 58-60. For example, Claim 58 recites “wherein the one or more actions further comprise determining, based on the service policy, whether a vendor associated with the computer system can provide a solution to the detected fault.” Non-limiting support and further discussion related to this element can be found at least on page 1, line 19 - page 2, line 2, page 5, lines 14-25 and page 6, lines 6-17, page 7 lines 12 - 22.

As another example, Claim 59 recites “wherein the one or more actions further comprise determining, based on the service policy, whether a knowledge base contains pertinent information about the detected fault.” Non-limiting support and further discussion related to this element can be found at least on page 1, lines 19-22, page 2, lines 23-30, page 3, lines 9-15, page 5, lines 14-25, page 7, lines 12-22, and page 9, lines 12-16.

An another example, Claim 60 recites “wherein the one or more actions comprise determining, based on the service policy, whether software associated with the computer system should be updated.” Non-limiting support and further discussion related to this element can be found at least on page 1, line 19 - page 2, line 2, page 2, lines 23-30, page 5, lines 1-6, page 5, lines 14-23, page 6, lines 6-17, page 7, lines 12-22, page 9, lines 17-21.

As a result, Claims 58-60 are allowable for at least these additional reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 58-60.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Samir A. Bhavsar, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6581.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge the **\$810.00** Request for Continued Examination Fee, and to the extent necessary, charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Samir A. Bhavsar
Reg. No. 41,617

Date: September 23, 2010

Correspondence Address:

at Customer No. **05073**